

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-34 were previously pending. As noted above, claims 7, 17, 21, 22 and 29 have been amended, and claims 35-89 have been added. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the Specification.<sup>1</sup> Thus, claims 1-89 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application based on the following remarks.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13, 17-19, 21-25, 27 and 34 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Frid et al. (US Patent No. 6,560,239) in view of Koivupuro et al. (US Patent No. 7,027,814).

Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Carlsson et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0145987) in view of Koivupuro et al. (US Patent No. 7,027,814).

Claims 4-6, 10, 14-16, 20, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Frid et al. and Koivupuro and further in view of Carlsson.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as there is no combination of Frid, Koivupuro and Carlsson that discloses or suggests the recited subject matter. In particular, there is no combination of the cited references that disclose or suggest a method, wireless communication device,

Referring to independent claims 1, 11, 21, 27, 30, 32 and 34, the Examiner admits that Frid and Carlsson fail to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter relating to receiving or transmitting a message from a second network through a first air interface if a message format of the message is configured to be allowed.<sup>2</sup>

The Examiner relies on Koivupuro to cure the deficiencies of Frid and Carlsson, however, Koivupuro also fails to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter.

The Examiner cites to Fig. 2B and col. 5, lines 36-39, and lines 33-42 are reproduced below to provide additional context:

Fig. 2B is a flow chart illustrating a test for allowing or rejecting new calls. Fig. 2B related to the preferred embodiment of the invention having upper limits for each call type (voice, data, fax, etc.) In step 21, a request for a new call is

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs 36 and 38-45.

<sup>2</sup> Office Action mailed December 9, 2009, pages 4-5, 6 and 8.

detected. In step 22, the call type is determined (voice, data or fax). In step 23, the current number N for this call type is compared with the current upper limit NMAX of the same call type. In  $N=NMAX$  for this call type (i.e. the upper limit has already been reached), the call will be rejected in step 27.

As such, Koivupuro teaches a system and method where an upper limit is set, and that a call is rejected if the upper limit has already been reached. Thus, the decision of whether or not to reject the call, as taught by Koivupuro, is based on a number of calls relative to a limit.

Therefore, Koivupuro fails to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter relating to receiving or transmitting a message from a second network through a first air interface if a message format of the message is configured to be allowed.

Thus, independent claims 1, 11, 21, 27, 30, 32 and 34 are allowable over any combination of the cited references.

Claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-26, 28, 29, 31 and 33 depend from a respective one of these independent claims, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, each of these claims separately recites a combination of subject matter that is not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references.

For example, referring to claims 7, 17, 22 and 29, there is no combination of the cited references that disclose or suggests that the one or more message format types comprises one or more types of pages. Thus, these claims are patentable.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-34.

#### *New Claims*

Claims 35-89 have been added to recite disclosed subject matter that is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35, and are patentable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 35, as well as for the reasons discussed above for claims 7, 17, 22 and 29.

Claims 36-67 are patentable over any combination of the cited references, which fail to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter relating to maintaining a session for a packet switched network connection of a mobile station established in a first region while in a second region. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of these claims.

Application No. 10/692,907  
Amendment dated June 3, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2008

Claims 68-89 are patentable over any combination of the cited references, which fail to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter relating to maintaining a circuit switched network connection of a mobile station established in a first region while in a second region. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of these claims.

Therefore, claims 35-89 are patentable.

Application No. 10/692,907  
Amendment dated June 3, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2008

### CONCLUSION

In light of these remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 3, 2009

By: 

Florin Corie, Reg. No. 46,244  
Direct: 858.658.3663

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502